

Serial No. 10/518,211

Reply to Final Office Action of February 16, 2010

PATENT  
PU020299  
Customer No. 24498**Remarks/Arguments**

In the final Office Action dated February 16, 2010, claims 1-11 remain pending in the application. Claims 1, 7, and 10 are independent claims. Claims 3 and 6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

**Rejection of claims 1 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Byers et al. (US Pat 6,693,901), hereinafter referred to as Byers.**

Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the following reasons, claims 1 and 4 are not anticipated by Byers.

For example, claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

... a first routing engine having input and output sides ... wherein data flows in to the input sides of the first, second, and third routing engines and data flows out from the output sides of the first, second, and third routing engines. ... (Emphasis added).

Applicants submit that for at least the following reasons, claims 1 and 4 are not anticipated by Byers.

In the Response to Arguments section, the Office Action at paragraph 21 alleges that the claims do not require separate input and output sides, and therefore Byers' control routing circuits anticipates a routing engine because the control routing circuits are also used to control device communications. Applicants respectfully disagree because claim 1 clearly requires a first routing engine having input and output sides, whereas Byers only suggests support for bi-directional traffic.

However, the Office Action at paragraph 23 indicates that the claims would be distinguishable over Byers if the claims required information to flow in a particular manner through the router. In an effort to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify the data flow with respect to the routers. Claim 1 as amended requires, in part, wherein data flows in to the input sides of the first, second, and third routing engines and data flows out from the output sides of the first, second, and third routing engines. Claim 1 as amended requires information to

Serial No. 10/518,211

PATENT  
PU020299  
Customer No. 24498

Reply to Final Office Action of February 16, 2010

flow in a particular manner through the router. As such, claim 1 is distinguishable over Byers and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) should be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 4 depends from and incorporates all the features of allowable claim 1. Furthermore, dependent claim 4 includes additional distinguishing features. For dependent claim 4, Applicants essentially repeat the above arguments from claim 1 and apply them to dependent claim 4. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 4 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency on allowable parent claim 1 and respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection to claim 4.

**Rejection of claims 7, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Civanlar et al. (US Pat 6,078,963), hereinafter referred to as Civanlar.**

Applicants submit that for at least the following reasons, claims 7, 10, and 11 are not anticipated by Civanlar.

For example, claim 7 requires, in part: *"means for coupling said at least three broadcast router components wherein said input side of each of said broadcast router component is connected, by a discrete link, to each and every one of the other said input sides of said broadcast router components."* (Emphasis added).

In the Office Action, page 4, the examiner alleges that Civanlar at col. 7 lines 59-61 and fig. 1 discloses the feature of said input side of each of said linear expandable broadcast router component is connected, by a discrete link, to each and every one of the other said input sides of said broadcast router components. Applicants respectfully disagree with this allegation because the interconnections of the switching fabric 102 of Civanlar are transitory and not discrete. Furthermore, the data flow in Civanlar is such that both ends of a link may not function as inputs at the same time.

However, in an effort to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 7 and 10 in similar fashion to claim 1 to clarify the data flow with respect to the routers. Claims 7 and 10 as amended require information to flow in a particular manner through the router. Civanlar does not disclose such routing flow. As such,

Serial No. 10/518,211

PATENT  
PU020299  
Customer No. 24498

Reply to Final Office Action of February 16, 2010

claims 7 and 10 are distinguishable over Civanlar and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) should be withdrawn.

Claim 11 depends from claim 10 and thus incorporates by reference the features of claim 10. Therefore, claim 11 is not anticipated by Civanlar for the same reasons as claim 10. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection to claims 7, 10, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

**Rejection of claims 2 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Byers, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Choe (US Pub 2002/0118682), hereinafter Choe.**

Claims 2 and 5 ultimately depend from claim 1 and thus incorporate the features of claim 1. Choe does not cure the deficiency of Byers as noted above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claims 2 and 5 patently distinguish over the combination of Byers and Choe for the same reasons as discussed above for claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection to claims 2 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

**Rejection of claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Civanlar, as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Lydon et al. (US Pat 6,680,939), hereinafter Lydon.**

Claims 8 and 9 ultimately depend from claim 7 and thus incorporate the features of claim 7. Lydon does not cure the deficiency of Civanlar as noted above with respect to claim 7. Therefore, claims 8 and 9 patently distinguish over the combination of Civanlar and Lydon for the same reasons as discussed above for claim 7. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection to claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Serial No. 10/518,211

PATENT  
PU020299  
Customer No. 24498

Reply to Final Office Action of February 16, 2010

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, applicants solicit entry of this amendment and allowance of the claims. If the Examiner cannot take such action, the Examiner should contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6820 to arrange a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview.

Respectfully submitted,

Carl Christensen, et al

By: Robert B. Levy  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 28,234  
Phone (609) 734-6820Patent Operations  
Thomson Licensing LLC  
P.O. Box 5312  
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312

April 28, 2010